Seed of Satan - Literal or Figurative?

by Lt. Col. Jack Mohr, AUS RET.

A hot argument is inflicting Identity Christianity today. It concerns the proper translation of Genesis 3:15, and gathers around a heathen philosophy which states that mother Eve was seduced by Satan himself, in the Garden of Eden and that the Jewish race came from this seduction and that this was what Jesus was speaking about, when He told the Pharisees in John 8:44: "Ye are of your father the devil ."

This booklet will be more or less a review of a book titled **THE SEED OF THE SERPENT,** written by James E. Wise. I picked this book, because it was short, yet expresses the main ideas of those within **IDENTITY** who are called **SEEDLINERS.**

It is not my purpose to poke fun at, or in any way show disrespect for those brethren who believe this heathen error. My purpose is to show you what the Scriptures say, then let you use the God given intelligence you have, to see and understand the truth.

Error is always bad, but error involving the teaching of God's Word, can be fatal. For once error creeps in any way, it is an opening the enemy has, which will lead to its complete destruction.

The key to **SEEDLINE** doctrine is found in Gen. 3:15, where God speaking to mother Eve and the "serpent" in the Garden, after the "fall," says: "And I (God) will put enmity between thee (serpent) and the woman (Eve), and between thy seed, and her seed; it (woman's seed) shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head, and thou (the serpent) shall bruise his heel." The main argument of the **SEEDLINERS** in this verse is that God is speaking to Satan, the fallen angel, who has just finished with his sexual seduction of mother Eve. But unfortunately, for their explanation, there is no indication that God is speaking to Satan. The Bible clearly says (Gen. 3:14) - "The Lord God said to the serpent (small "s" . . . because thou hast done this (whatever the act might have been), thou are cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." No indication here of some super-natural beings, since the Word says God addressed the serpent as He would have addressed one of the cattle of the field. The word "serpent" as used here and throughout this chapter is #5175 in Strong's Concordance - "nachash," which simply means a "snake from its hiss." If the word had been capitalized, it might have had reference to a non-Adamic person, but by no stretch of the most vivid imagination can it refer to Satan.

Let's look at a few more "key" words in this verse: **ENMITY** - #996 - Heb. "biyn" meaning: "between; among; within. In actuality it has seven different meanings, only the three mentioned above can fit into this setting."

SEED - #2233 - "zera" meaning: "fruit; plant; sowing time; posterity; carnally, child; fruitful; seed-time; sowing time". It can very easily refer to children or posterity. The same word is used for the "seed of the serpent," as for the "seed of the woman."

But we find no indication here of who the "seed of the serpent" might be, racially speaking, if it is speaking of race here, which I doubt.

Just as no one today can say with certainty: "I am of the seed of Abraham," since there are no records to prove it, so no one can say with certainty that the "seed of the serpent must be the Jew, or Canaanite, of Khazar, or Edomite."

When author Wise states that Gen. 3:15 states that God is declaring that the devil would have literal seed, just as Eve, he is "assuming" since this is not what this verse says at all.

It is impossible for our finite minds to reason this out, for we have no basis for this kind of

reasoning. Because Eve was to have literal seed, culminating in the "seed Christ Jesus," does not mean that Satan also would have literal seed, culminating in a people we call Jews. There is no verification here, except a twisting of the Scriptures to make them say what the **SEEDLINERS** want to hear.

Mr. Wise goes on to state that if we study the first six verses of Genesis three, we will be able to "know" the act committed by our first parents, which caused the world to turn from the perfection of Gen. 1:31, to the corruption of Gen. 6:5, 12.

The alienation between God and His formed creatures Adam and Eve, came through disobedience, not through a sexual union with a super-angel.

While Eve had been warned by God not to eat of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil," He has said nothing to her, which is recorded, about "touching it." (See Gen. 3:17). Eve was the one who added the "touching business," when she talked with the serpent. Like so many of our people, she thought she had to add to the Word.

The author then goes on to "surmise", since he has no Scriptural proof, that the "trees", in the Garden were not made up of "sap, bark, and foliage." In other words, these trees were not really trees, since trees cannot "discern between good and evil." Yet nothing written in this Scripture indicates that these "trees", whatever they may have been, were supposed to do any discerning. The word **TREE** as used in this passage comes from the Hebrew word " 'ets", #6095 and means. "a tree for its firmness; hence wood; gallows; helve; stock; timber; tree; wood." Absolutely no indication here that it refers to a "person," or "being" of any kind, such as a "serpent," or "Satan." He goes on to compound his strange explanation by stating that these "trees" were endowed with the gift of speech. Show me anywhere where the Scriptures so states.

Now I'll freely admit that Eve's adversary, called a "serpent" had the power of speech, since the Word says so. Whether he was an actual snake, or a member of one of the Pre-**ADAMIC** races, I do not know, since we are not told.

Wise then mentions that the Apostle Paul uses "races" and "trees" synonymously when he speaks about the Gentiles in Romans 11:27, as being a "wild olive tree." Here the word for tree is #65, in Greek, "Agrillaious," meaning; strangely~enough "a wild olive tree." In vs. 24, the "olive tree" becomes #3586 -"Xulon," meaning, 'timber, (as a fuel or material); by implication a stick; club; tree; or other wooden article.)

In Gal. 3:13 where Paul says: "Curseth is everyone who hangeth on a tree," he is quoting from the Old Testament and the word is #3586, "xulon". But in James 3:12, where the Apostle asks the question: "Can the fig tree bear olive berries?" the word for **TREE** is #4808 - "suke" which means plainly a "fig tree." You see, the word **TREE,** has three different meanings in the Old Testament and five in the New, yet in none of these instances does it refer to "races of people."

In Ezekiel 31:3, where the Assyrians were described as a "cedar in Lebanon," it was not a racial connotation, but simply a "figure of speech," explaining the greatness of Assyria.

In Jer. 11:19, these words were not written about Jesus, as Wise avers, but about Jeremiah, see vs. 21 for explanation. Here the **TREE** is #6086, - " 'ets" meaning simply a tree. Here again it is used as a figure of speech.

In Matt. 3:10 and Luke 3:9, where reference is made: "And now also the axe is laid to the root," (#4491 - "rhiza" meaning "a root") of the trees . . . " The word for **TREES** is #1186, "dedron" meaning: "an oak: a tree). Again, it is merely a figure of speech, having nothing whatsoever to do with race of any kind. Yet the author clearly implies, without any Scriptural backing whatsoever, that John the Baptist meant that now Jesus, the Messiah, had come and all "races" would be brought before Him for judgment.

What these verses actually say (9-11) is that having Abraham as your father is not "all that counts," but that men, not "races" will be judged, not by who their father was, but by their works.

Wise then goes on to make some very positive statements, which I do not believe he can back with Scripture. At least he doesn't do it here. He says: "Therefore (because of the explanations he has given), that which was spoken of or called the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," was the devil. In other places he is called the devil, Belial, etc." But there is no Scripture which will back up his contention, no matter how much you want to believe there is. The idea that Satan or the devil was the seducer of Eve in the Garden, may fit in with your theological concept, but it's not what the Word says.

The author then mentions other trees in the garden when he says: "In Gen. 2:9, God first mentions the stationary trees, pecan, peach, apricot, etc." For the life of me, I can't find any of these trees listed anywhere in the Bible. The apple tree is listed, but no pecan, apricot or peach. If he's imagining these trees in the Garden, maybe he imagining when he says Satan was there too. If a man will add words which aren't there, in order to "sell his point," he's not to be trusted in his explanation. This man is "intellectually dishonest," and is willing to twist Scripture to make it say what he wants it to.

He then goes on to the "tree of life." He indicates that these "trees" were personalities of some kind or other, although the Bible says they were trees and in the original language that is what they were. No chance to make them anything other than trees.

He compounds his fantasy by saying that these two trees "vied for Adam and Eve's affection." Where he got this fantastic idea from I don't know, I just know it isn't in the Book. He keeps on "supposing" as he develops his "fairy story". "Eve looked from one tree to another," he said, "she was captivated by the exquisite beauty of the **TREE OF KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL,** but when she looked at the **TREE OF LIFE,** she saw the Messiah who was prophesied of in Isaiah 53:2 - 'He had no form or comeliness, and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we shall desire Him.'"

He then furthers this "pipe dream" by stating that the **TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL,** (Satan, of course) had been in Eden since the beginning and quotes Ezekiel 28:12-15 to prove this.

But, lo and behold, when we read this passage of Scripture in an honest manner, we find out that it refers to the King of Tyrus, and yes, I know all about those Bible scholars who say it also refers to Satan. (But it doesn't say that does it? It infers that it might be someone different than the King, but nowhere does it say this).

There are some difficult things to equate with the king of Tyrus, because it appears that this "man" or "being", whatever he may have been, and he was a "male" from the wording of the passage, was a super natural being of some sort or other, although he is not called Satan, nor is it hinted that he might be Satan. We have to allow our imaginations to run amok, to come up with this idea. It appears that this "being" was in God's abode and was very powerful there, until the day when he revolted against God and was cast down to the ground (vs. 17). Remember how Jesus said in Luke10:18 - "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven?"

So author Wise, taking a little bit of Scripture here, and a little bit there, assumes that since Scripture doesn't indicate it, we must assume that when Eve looked at the two **TREES** in the Garden, she was looking at **SATAN** and **CHRIST** and that **CHRIST** was the **TREE OF LIFE.**

Now I have no argument about **CHRIST** being the **TREE OF LIFE,** since He is the only one who can give life to a spiritually dead human. But to say that Eve looked on Him and saw no beauty, (and by the way the description of Christ given in Isaiah refers to His trial and crucifixion and had nothing to do with Him before,) that she saw no beauty in Christ. But when she looked at the "serpent," Satan of course, she was captivated with his beauty and succumbed to temptation and had a sexual affair with him.

Now this is pretty far fetched, I think, for it is the same teaching you find in the **BABYLONIAN**

TALMUD, and in most heathen "phallic religions" of the Far East. Wise implies that the **FRUIT** of the trees of knowledge of good and evil, was sexual union, even though the Hebrew word for "fruit," as it is used here (6529), means: "Bough; fruitful; reward." There is hardly any room here for any sexual interpretation of the word, unless your mind is sexually oriented. Then I guess you can see sex in anything. Certainly the **SEEDLINERS SEE SEX IN THIS PASSAGE.** Shows you where their mind is, doesn't it?

Wise then indicates that up to this point, only Eve had partaken of the "forbidden fruit," which he has not as yet Scripturally defined. Then he says, shortly thereafter, no time, whether minutes, hours, or the next day, he doesn't say, because he has no indication of this time from any Scriptural source, Eve gave of the fruit, (whatever it may have been) to Adam, and he did "eat." Now the Hebrew word for "eat", as used throughout this chapter is #398, "akal" meaning. to eat; burn up; consume; devour; dine; feed with; food." There is absolutely no indication that this simple act was a sexual act, it was merely partaking of food of some sort.

Wise implies that it was the "sinful, sexual act," that changed Adam and Eve from "sinless purity to being shamed of their nakedness." From every study of Scripture I can find, it was their "disobedience" of God's command that caused them to be ashamed and fearful.

When they discovered they were naked, (which is an act God deplores, see Ex. 32:25; 2 Chron. 28:19), they made aprons for themselves from fig leaves to cover their sexual parts. To Wise, this implies guiltiness in a sexual act, the Bible says: "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." It seems to be that this author is over-obsessed with sex.

Then he makes another positive statement which he cannot back with Scripture, when he says: ". . . a careful study of the Scriptures will definitely prove that the sin committed by our first parents was a sexual sin and that Eve was a 'fallen woman,' after she partook of the forbidden fruit." This statement is simply untrue, for Scriptures shows no such thing.

If Eve was a "fallen woman," as Wise avers, then she could not have been the pure ancestor of our Lord Jesus Christ.

God had told His creation to be "fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth." (Gen. 1:28) This could not have been accomplished without "sexual union." It certainly wasn't the case when it came to the birds and animals. Babies were not found under cabbage leaves by these first people, the pre-**ADAMIC ONES**. I personally believe that if God had considered the act of "sex" as a sin, he would have warned Adam and Eve against that "beautiful being" who Wise says was in the garden, who might sexually seduce Eve." What a bunch of absolute nonsense this sexual bit is! This is not the manner in which our God works. It may fit in with the God of the Jewish Talmudic religion, or the heathen Babylonian religion from which the Masons and the Seedliners get their facts, but it doesn't fit in with the manner in which the God of the Bible operates.

Wise then goes on to compound his error by stating that the sorrow Eve would have in child birth, was due to the "sexual nature of her sin." Again, I say, absolute hogwash!

If Eve was punished for a "sexual act," why wasn't Adam punished sexually also? Adam was the one who was really at fault, or so the Scriptures indicate. We are told in 1 Timothy 2:14 that Eve was "deceived". The Greek word used here for the English "deceived," is "apato," (538) which simply means: "to cheat; delude; deceive." This Scripture clearly states that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman (Eve) being deceived was in the transgression." In 2 Cor. 11:3, the same Scripture writer indicates that Eve was beguiled in her mind, not through her sexual parts. In other words, Adam knew what he was doing when he sinned, but Eve was deceived (fooled). Adam knew he was disobeying God when he partook of the forbidden fruit, so if his was also a sexual sin, then why wasn't he punished sexually? You may say that he didn't know what Eve had done? The Bible certainly doesn't indicate this. It pretty clearly shows that he was with Eve when this incident took place. Wise is "way out in left field," when he states that God's words to Eve: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," (vs. 16) indicates that Eve's desire had been towards

someone else. Again, there would be a stronger word than "hogwash" used here to indicate the absolute ridiculousness of this statement!

He then "supposes" some more when he states that Eve's sin was in cohabiting with Satan and not her husband. Once he starts "supposing," he never stops. Scripture be damned!

When the Apostle Paul admonished the church at Corinth not to be a partaker of Eve's sin, he said: "For I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent (if it was Satan, why didn't Paul say so, he was usually pretty outspoken when it came to naming the adversary), beguiled (#1185 - 'deleazo' meaning: "to entrap; allure; beguile; entice," (nothing of a sexual nature here) Eve through his subtlety (#3834 - 'ponourgos' meaning: 'shrewdness; craftiness;') should be corrupted from the simplicity that was in Christ."

Paul was not warning the Christian women at Corinth to avoid sexual contact with Satan, or a snake. He was merely using this as an illustration to tell them not to be led astray by clever fakirs who would come preaching another, false Jesus.

In no way does Gen. 3:16 indicate that God is telling Eve that two seeds, one of Satan, and the other of Adam, are in her womb and that they will be the bitterest of enemies. He is telling Eve in essence, "You sinned by disobeying me (1 John 3:4) and this is the penalty you must pay." He had already pronounced the death penalty on them when He said: "If ye eat thereof (not have sexual union, but eat) you will surely die." Doesn't it seem strange to you, that our God, who is not a God of confusion, would so confuse this issue that he would not have clearly named Satan, if this had actually been a sexual sin between Satan and Eve?

If you will check throughout Scripture, you will find that our God always warns men and women of the dangers of sin. It doesn't make any sense to me, that He would have allowed Satan, a so-called "fallen angel," to invade His garden and violate His perfect creation, without first having given Adam and Eve warning about it. There is no Scriptural evidence that either Adam or Eve were ever warned about a "sexual encounter with the Talmudic Satan." This idea comes straight to Christianity from the halls of ancient Babylon and the Jewish Talmud. It doesn't come through the Christian Bible, no matter what translation you use.

Genesis 4:1, is very clear: In simple words it states that Adam had sexual relations with Eve and that a son named Cain was born, then later, Able. We have reason to believe they were twins. But Wise states, again without any Scriptural backing, when Eve stated: "I have gotten a man from the Lord," she thought Cain was her firstborn and she thought he was the promised seed, she later acknowledges that Abel, not Cain, was the promised seed. Therefore, if Able was her promised seed, then Cain would have to be the seed or progeny of the serpent."

There is absolutely no Scriptural evidence which indicates that Eve thought that Able was the "promised seed." Verse 25, which Wise quotes as confirmation of this statement merely says that w! 1en Eve had Seth, she said: "God has appointed me another seed instead of Able, whom Cain slew." She is merely stating that God gave her a son to replace the one who had been killed. Nothing is said here about "promised seed."

1 John 3:12 does not "plainly denote that Cain was the offspring or progeny of the wicked one." The word "of" does not necessarily mean "progeny." The Bible dictionary says the word Cain means "acquisition," which means: "the act of having as one's own; to get or gain through one's efforts." "Seth: means to "compensate; a sprout," it has nothing whatsoever to do with being a substitute as Wise avers. I wonder where this man got his information or if he just dreamed it up, the latter seems the more possible.

The **SEEDLINERS** love Gen. 4:1, they say that Eve was fooled into believing that she had had sexual relations with God Himself. My reaction is that she was saying what any Christian woman might, when her firstborn son arrived: "God gave me a son!" But no, they say Eve was fooled into thinking that Cain was God's son. She didn't realize she had been had by Satan.

But let's analyze Gen. 4:1, very carefully and see what it really says, not what some man thinks it says. Read it for yourself, it is very clear. I can find no hint in this chapter, that Even thought Able was the "promised seed." How could he have been when he was killed. Do you mean that God would have given a "promised seed" to Eve, only to have him murdered? It doesn't make much sense, does it? The promised seed was "Seth," who God gave to her to take the place of Able. It becomes a gross assumption on the part of the author, when he states: "because of this, Cain could only have been the progeny of the serpent." When we quote the 1 John 3:12 verse about Cain being of that "wicked one," we must see vs. 12 in its context, it cannot be lifted out of its proper setting just to prove a point that someone wants to make. In verse 8 of this chapter we are told that: "He that committeth sin (transgresseth also the law, 1 John 3:4) is of the devil: for the devil sinneth from the beginning. (I believe that the Apostle John is referring here to Satan's revolt against God, which is referred to in Ezekiel 28:15-19. It makes no hint of anything which happened in the Garden of Eden, since this was not "the beginning.") For this purpose the Son of God was manifested (5319 meaning to "render apparent; to declare; make manifest; shew oneself"). That He might destroy the works of the devil. Whatsoever is born of God ("spiritual rebirth" - "born from above" John 3:3) doth not commit sin (violate God's law); for his seed (#4690, meaning: "something sown; by implication offspring; issue) remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God."

John then goes on to explain this in the verses that follow: "In this the children of God are manifest (he is not referring here to the white Israelite seed of Abraham, but to all those who have been "born from above") and the children of the devil." **NOTICE VERY CAREFULLY NOW!** "Whosoever **DOETH NOT RIGHTEOUSNESS** (follow God's law) **IS NOT OF GOD,** neither is he that loveth not his brother. For this is the message that we (disciples of Jesus) heard from the beginning (of Christ's earthly ministry), that we should love one another."

He then goes on to explain that these actions must not be like those of Cain, who was of that wicked one and slew his brother, and wherefore slew he him? Because his (Cain's) own works were evil, and his brother's (Abel's) righteous." It had nothing whatsoever to do with who was their physical father. This is confirmed in Gen. 4:7, where God told Cain that if he obeyed God's law, he would do well and be accepted, but if he did not do well (refused to obey God's law), then "sin lieth at the door." A rebellious Israelite who refused to obey God's law, is just as much a "child of Satan," as is the Jew, or the heathen. This relationship has nothing to do with our first parents and any of their acts, other than that we today have a "sin nature," every one of us, because our first parents "disobeyed God's law."

John was confirming that we could tell who were the children of Satan, by their actions towards their Christian brothers. He was not speaking of the "brotherhood of all men, under the fatherhood of God," which is a Talmudic concept, but of the "brotherhood" shared by those who had accepted Jesus Christ and thus can call God "Father". (See 1 John 2:22, 23).

Some argument is used because Cain is not found in Adam's lineage. Neither is Able. But this is not due to the fact that he was not a son of Adam, but because of his sin, not only of murdering his--brother, but then of intermarrying with others not of the **ADAMIC LINE** (Gen. 4:16, 17). This cut him off from his heritage. The first child of Adam and Eve, mentioned in any Bible genealogy of Adam, always starts with Seth.

We can reasonably assume that Cain and Able were twins and that they reached manhood together. In verses 3, 4 we find where these two boys brought their offerings to God at the same time.

Anyone who knows about twin births knows there is only one conception and that the babies, although they may be born hours apart, are still considered to be twins. There have been a few, very isolated cases, where two different men have impregnated the same woman, within a short period, and the children born to her had the characteristics of their fathers. But there is certainly no Scriptural evidence, even by a stretch of the most vivid imagination that this happened here. Even if it could be proven that the "serpent" was one of the pre-Adamic races, the case would be stronger than to believe Eve was impregnated by a "super-spiritual" being. This smacks of oriental sorcery.

We could almost be sacrilegious by comparing this birth to that of our Savior, who was "conceived by the Holy Spirit," according to Matthew 1:20 and Luke 1:35. Yet no **SEEDLINER**, that I know of would assume to believe that the Holy Spirit, which is a spiritual being like Satan, had physical intercourse with the Virgin Mary. But this in essence is what they believe in the case of Eve and it is just as ridiculous.

Author Wise then jumps to another part of the Bible in his vain attempt to prove the **SEEDLINE** theory. He thees the Parable of the Tares as an example and explains that this Parable shows God sowing the "good seed," since it says in Luke 3:38 that Adam was a son of God, and that Eve was taken from his body.

Then along comes this nasty serpent, that arch spiritual being we call Satan, who sowed some seed of his own. He did his sowing in the body of mother Eve and Cain was the result. The time of the "fruit," was when the two boys, Cain and Able, reached maturity and brought their offsprings to God.

But the Bible clearly tells us that Cain's offspring was refused because "sin lieth at the door." It wasn't refused because Satan was his father. There is no such implication. Cain had deliberately broken God's law and this was the reason his sacrifice was not approved. Preachers have speculated that the reason it was not accepted was that it was not a blood offering, but there is no proof of this. The Bible simply says: "sin lay at the door of Cain's heart." It had nothing to do with the fact that Cain's offering were of the "first fruits of the ground," instead of an animal sacrifice.

Then Wise goes a step further and says that in order for us to understand the Parable of the Wheat and Tares, it is necessary for us to go back to the beginning in the Garden of Eden, since this passage is an almost perfect repetition of what is written in the first four chapters of Genesis. Maybe if you have a vivid imagination, such as author Wise evidently has.

Apparently the disciples were intrigued by this parable, but could not understand its meaning. So Jesus explained it to them and told them that the "tares," (#2215 - "zizanion," a false grain called "darnel," which looks like wheat), were the "children of the wicked one." The word "children" in Greek is (#5207 - "huioa" and means "immediate, remote or figurative kinship." So if the word civenefer to "figurative kinship," why are the **SEEDLINERS** so adamant in stating it means "literal kinship?" Wise says this Parable agrees perfectly with I John A:8, but in this passage, the words refer to "all unsaved men and women," who are figuratively children of Satan. They retain this position, even if they are Israelite descendants of Abraham, until such time as they are saved from the "power of evil," through the "new birth." Remember that Christ came to destroy the "works of the devil" (evil).

Most Bible students will tell you that Cain's progeny was destroyed in the deluge (great flood). But this Parable has nothing to do with the "beginning," it was for the "end of this present age." The "tares", those who disobey God's law and refuse to be reconciled to Him, will be gathered at this time by the reapers, who will be "angels," not "white Israelites, bent on vengeance." Wise carefully leaves out the part where Jesus warns His followers to leave these "children of the devil alone," ". . . lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." That's something for our **IDENTITY** folks to ponder on, especially those who want to go out and slaughter all who believe differently than they.

This is one of the biggest problems with the **SEEDLINE** people. They are more concerned with "pulling up the tares," whom they say are the Jewish people, then in getting their own house in order and their own Israelite people in a right relationship with God, so that He can do the "rooting out work." As a result, we find the **SEEDLINERS** doing exactly what Jesus warned them not to do, "rooting up the wheat along with the tares."

In no way does this Parable point to specific people by race, who are literal descendants of Satan, coming from his union with Mother Eve.

I can assure you from the Word of God, that when the "rooting up" process takes place, there are going to be "white Israelites" among the "tares," who will be rooted up along with God'~ other enemies. (Read and study Ezekiel chapter 20).

On page 7 of Wise's narrative, we get down to the "nitty-gritty" of the **SEEDLINE** belief. Wise says we have seen an abundance of evidence which proves that Satan has literal, physical seed and that they are in constant friction with the Adamic race; that they are abusive to the rights, laws, and privileges of others; that they would be unassimilated anywhere they went, a nation within a nation."

It is quite obvious that he is referring to the Jewish people. Now it is true that the Apostle Paul accused them of killing their own prophets and of persecuting Christians, and that "they please not God, but are contrary to all men." But it should be quite obvious, to anyone with a small amount of common sense, that most of the Jewish people cannot be traced back to the time of Jesus, to say anything about the Garden of Eden. We know from the Scriptural account that many were converted to Judaism at the time of Esther, (Esther 8:17), about 510 B.C. We need to realize that the Persian Empire at this time covered most of the known world and that men and women of many nations and colors, became Jews.

Later in the 8th Century A.D. the Khazar people of Southeast Rusthe were converted to Judaism and today the Ashkenazi (Khazar) Jews, make up almost 90% of the Jewish people. How did Cain get from the Land of Nod, all the way up to Russia, to become the forefather of the Ashkenazi? How can we trace them back to the Garden of Eden and an illicit affair between a "super-angel" and an Adamic woman? What about Jews such as Sammy Davis, Jr., and Liz Taylor and the several thousand professing Christians who are converted to Judaism every year, can they be traced back to this sexual mess in Eden? I sincerely doubt it!

We know what Jesus thought about these converts to Judaism for He told the Jewish scribes in Matt. 23:15 - ". . . ye compass (go over) sea and land to make one proselyte (convert) and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more a child of hell than yourselves." Here again, the word "child" can refer to "figurative kinship." Certainly we cannot say with any degree of accuracy, that these Jewish proselytes can trace their ancestry back to Esau-Edom, and certainly not to the Garden of Eden.

In 1 John 2:22, 23, we have a very clear "word picture" of an anti-Christ. But because it fits the Jewish people to a "T", doesn't make them of the Seedline of Satan, since there are many from the Adamic **SEEDLINE**, who also fit these anti-Christ characteristics. I can point to quite a few within the **IDENTITY MOVEMENT,** who can't carry on a conversation without cursing or using foul language; some of them drink to excess; some of them follow the custom of "multiple marriages," using the example of Abraham as an excuse for their sexual excesses (men such as Jim Ellison of the C.S.A.) Some can't sit through an hour's Gospel message without going outside to contaminate their lungs with cigarette smoke. Does this mean that these un-Godly "white people," can be traced back to Satan and Mother Eve, because their deeds are evil? I think not!

In 1 John 4:3, we are told that: "Every spirit that confesseth (acknowledges) not that Jesus is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is the spirit of anti-Christ." We don't have to go to the Jews to find this kind of folks, we can find them among our own kind. It certainly fits white people like Ben Klassen, the Pontius Maximus and his Church of Creativity, who created a new religion because he didn't like the one the Bible taught.

1 John 3:10 does not confirm the existence of two "Physical seeds" when it says: "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil." Those of us who are "children of God," were not born of some physical union between God and an Adamic woman, namely Eve - any more than the children of Satan were born of a sexual act between Satan and Eve. If the word "of" refers to a physical thing for the devil, then it must of necessity mean a physical thing for God and I don't know any **SEEDLINER** who would be blasphemous enough to accuse God of having a sexual affair with Eve which resulted in the birth of Able or even Seth.

But now we come to the interesting part, where this **SEEDLINE** "guru," (spiritual teacher advisor) is going to prove to us that the people we now know as Jews are of the physical progeny of Satan.

He takes us back, of course, to that controversial eighth chapter of John's Gospel, the one the Jews want taken out of the New Testament. In vs. 23 we find Jesus speaking to the Jewish leaders: "Ye are from beneath; I am from above." Is Jesus speaking here of their physical origin? Look and see for yourself! We can see that Jesus is speaking here in a "figurative" sense, if we will compare this verse with His words to the Jewish leaders in Matt. 15:13. Here He says: "Every plant (#5451 - meaning: "a shrub or vegetable"), which my Heavenly Father hath not planted (#5452 meaning "to set out in the earth"), shall be rooted up (#1610 -"uprooted").

The simple meaning of these words is quite obvious. Unless God "plants" or "instills" doctrine, it will come to nought and will be destroyed. It has nothing to do with the physical origin of any person or group of persons, much less tracing them back to a Satanic ancestor.

Jesus was telling the Pharisees: "You worship me (God) in vain (see vs. 9), because you have taught your doctrine's in the place of God's; therefore God will root out these false doctrines and destroy them." It's as simple as that!

Wise says that the word "beneath" is synonymous with "hell." It actually has three different meanings. In the Old Testament we see where "Deborah, Rebekah's nurse was buried beneath Bethel under an oak . . ." (Gen. 35:8) Here the Hebrew word for **BENEATH** is (8478, "tachath" which means: "bottom, below; underneath, etc.) In Deut. 28:13 we have a different meaning: ". . . thou (Israel) shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be **BENEATH** . . ." Here the Hebrew word is (4295 - "mattach" meaning: "downward; below; beneath; very low; underneath).

Then there are three references to this word in the New Testament. The one quoted from John 8:23, also Mark 14:66 - "And Peter was beneath in the palace . . **."** (Here the word **BENEATH** in Greek is 2736 -"katatero" meaning: "downwards; beneath; bottom; down; under). The same meaning for the word is found in Acts 2:19 - "And I will show wonders in the heavens above, and signs in the earth **BENEATH** . . ." At no place in either the Old or New Testament is the word **BENEATH** synonymous with "hell." Now if Wise deliberately misleads his readers in this place, how can we trust his exegesis in other areas? In the Isa. 14:9 verse he quotes: "Hell from **BENEATH** is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming . . ." The word **BENEATH** is again (8478) which has nothing to do with "hell" itself.

It is true that Jesus could just as well have said: "You are from hell! I am from heaven!" But He did not! He did call them "children of hell," in Matt. 23:15, but the same term is used as descriptive of anyone who is in rebellion against God, even rebellious Israelites. (See 1 John 2:4; 3:8).

Jesus "figuratively" called the disciple Peter a "child of hell" when He rebuked him in Matt. 16:23 by saying: ". . . Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offense unto me .

In vs. 31, Wise goes on to quote how the Jews "that believed on Him (Jesus)," claimed to be descendants of Abraham and that Jesus admitted this claim in vs. 37, where He said: "I know ye are Abraham's seed . . ." But these Jews were not claiming to be Israelites, as Wise avers, but were admitting that they were the "seed of Abraham" through Esau-Edom. (The Jewish Encyclopedia admits that Edom is in Jewry). Verse 33 confirms that they were offspring of Esau, for if they would have been Israelites, they would have been in bondage both in Egypt and later in Assyria.

Again, when Jesus spoke to these Edomites in Matt. 23:32 and referred to them as "serpents and a generation of vipers," He was using a "figure of speech." He could have done the same against many in Israel. It would be like us calling a wicked man "a dirty rat." We know he isn't really a "rat," yet we use this term in a "figurative" sense, just as Jesus did.

If Jesus were to look at men such as Ben Klassen and His Church of Creativity, he could use the same terms as He did against the Edomite Pharisees, yet that would not mean that Klassen's physical ancestor was Satan.

Wicked men, whether Jew or Israelite, or heathen, are "children of that wicked one," in a figurative sense. I'm sure most of you realize this, even those who believe **SEEDLINE.**

Here again we see Wise as he does some more "supposing", when he states that the word **GENERATION** could be translated as **RACE.**

If you will check your Strong's Concordance, you will find the word Generation has five different meanings. In the Old Testament we find the Hebrew word ("daur" - 1755, which means: "an age; a dwelling; posterity".) It is used thusly in Gen. 7:1 - "And the Lord said unto Noah, come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this **GENERATION**." (Nothing here to do with **RACE**!)

We find a second meaning to the word in Dan. 4:3 - where the word is (#1859 "dar" meaning: "generation.")

In the New Testament, three Greek words are used for **GENERATION.** In Matt. 1:1 - "The Book of the **GENERATION** of Jesus Christ . . ." Here the word is "genesis, (#1078) which means: "nativity; figurative, nature; generation"). In Matt. 3:7 we read: ". . .**0 GENERATION** of vipers, who hath warned thee to flee from the wrath to come?" (Here the Greek word is "gennema: - #1081, meaning: "offspring; produce; fruit; generation.")

Finally in Matt. 12:41 we read: "The men of Ninevah shall rise up in judgment with this **GENERATION,** and shall condemn it". (Here the word is "genea," - #1974, meaning: "a generation; anage; nation; time").

This is the only occasion in the entire Bible where the word **GENERATION** could mean **RACE,** but we see from the context that this is not what it means here. Once again, Wise has borne "false witness" to what a word means.

At the bottom of p.8, he makes a true statement, when he says: "In many instances the Children of Israel married or had children by Canaanitish women. Judah, one of the sons of Israel married a Canaanitish woman, and there was a surviving son, Gen. 46:19. Simeon, another son of Jacob-Israel has a son by a Canaanitish woman, the son's name was Shoul, by one of the **WOMEN OF THIS DEVIL RACE**." Here again we see Wise's "supposing," in operation, since there is no indication here, or anywhere else, for that matter that the **CANAANITES** can be traced back to a sexual union between Satan and Mother Eve.

You see, my friends, when you begin "supposing," in your study of the Word of God, it is exceedingly difficult to stop and you must keep on **SUPPOSING**. The definition of this word is: "assume to be true, as for the sake of argument; to imagine; think, guess, or presume; to consider as a proposed possibility." Of course **TO ASSUME,** means to: "accept as true, lacking proof to the contrary." So what we see happening in Wise's book, **THE SEED OF THE SERPENT,** is a valiant effort to **ASSUME** something that the Word of God does not teach. This is true with most of the **SEEDLINE** arguments. When a man makes up his mind to something, because he **ASSUMES** it is true, without Scriptural proof, this fellow is skating on mighty thin ice and will probably fall through.

Wise then goes on to tell us how Solomon took wives and how the Judahites committed fornication on their return from Babylon with "this devil-sired race." Yet nowhere in the Scriptures does it say that the **CANAANITES** were "devil-sired. Wicked, no doubt about it, but not devil sired! The word **CANAANITE** is used 12 times in the Old Testament and twice in the New, on no occasion does it mention a "devil sired people." The word **CANAANITES** is used 54 times in the Old Testament and **CANAANITISH** twice, but at no place arey sey referred to as "devil sired." This comes only from the fertile imagination of a writer who ASSUMES. Then to strengthen their argument, or so they think, they state that all the early Identity leaders believed the **SEEDLINE DOCTRINE** and taught it. **THAT DOESN'T MAKE IT TRUE!**

Wise goes on to say in Deut. 7:1, that God mentions seven Canaanite nations and **KNOWING**

THEM TO BE THE SEED AND PROGENY OF THE DEVIL.

God commanded them to be destroyed. But that is not what the Word says and that is not what it intimates. They were not destroyed because they were a **DEVIL RACE,** but because they were an exceedingly wicked people, who worshiped idols, and if they remained in the land, they would lead Israel astray. We can assume, from the way they enticed the Israel men, that the Canaanitish women were exceedingly beautiful.

I'm sick and tired of Identity writers, or preachers who insist that God's Word says something which it does not say, just so they can prove a point of their twisted doctrine.

Since our God is not a God of confusion, doesn't it seem logical to you, that He would have clearly defined the enemies of His people as **CHILDREN OF SATAN,** if this had been true? But nowhere is this reference seen.

Wise insists that the **JEWS** were called **CANAANITES,** before they were called JEWS for the first time in 2 Kings 16:6, about 742 B.C. This could very well be, but is an assumption which cannot be borne out by Scripture.

These people were usurpers, there is little doubt of that. You can see this quite clearly in Mal. 1:2-4, where we have a clear picture of how God feels about them and what He intends to do about it. There is little doubt that Jesus was speaking about these **JEWISH** usurpers, in Rev. 2:9 and 3:9 when He referred to them as:

"Those who say they are Jews (Judeans) and are not; but are of the synagogue of Satan." He was referring to them again in Matt. 11:12, when He said that the Kingdom of heaven had suffered violence at their hands. At the time of Jesus, the Edomite Jews, the Pharisees, sat in Moses seat of authority and ruled ii-legally over the Israel people. But there is no proof that they were either **CANAANITES** or **CHILDREN OF SATAN!**

God had appointed His Israel people to be a "special, holy people," who according to 1 Peter 2:9 were to be: "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar (set aside for a special purpose; that ye (Israel) should show forth the praises of Him who called you out of darkness, into His marvelous light."

This was to be Israel's purpose. The **JEWS**, in their **TALMUD** say their purpose is to rule the world, and have 2,000 gentile slaves, and own all the property of the world. True Israel were to be a nation of ambassadors, showing forth the truth of the Kingdom message to all the world. God knew she would not remain true to Him if she inter-married with the un-Godly tribes in Palestine. But no-where in His warning to them, did He call them a **DEVIL SIRED PEOPLE.**

I have had unfortunate experiences with some people who call themselves **ISRAEL IDENTITY,** and who have by their actions appeared to be **DEVIL SIRED.** That doesn't make them literal children of Satan.

On page 11, Wise makes a statement which destroy his entire **SEEDLINE THEORY,** when he says: "anyone can read a pedigree or bill of sale and unmistakably know what it means." Then he uses the illustration of a **BILL OF SALE** for a thoroughbred horse. But he doesn't go far enough, for he should have said that if that **THOROUGHBRED** mare, ever was bred by a common stud, none of her offspring could ever be declared **THOROUGHBRED** again. The same is true of Mother Eve, and our pure King Jesus could have not come from an impure source.

Wise states that "Cain was a murderer from the beginning," yet his other teachings show that he does not mean this, for he believes that the pre-Adamic creation of Gen. 1:27, came into being thousands of years before Cain was born. So how could he apply the statement that Cain was in the beginning, when he was not.

Show me any statement in the Bible which says that Cain's murder of Able was the first murder committed. It was the first murder of the Adamic race as far as we know, but I really can't

comprehend that with millions of people on this earth, for thousands of years prior to Cain and Abel, that none had been killed maliciously. There is no indication anywhere that there was a "Garden of Eden atmosphere outside the actual Garden. In fact, there is indication that when Cain was banished from his Adamic background, he found refuge among the **non-ADAMIC** people of the earth, and Gen. 6:5 indicates they were an "exceedingly wicked people," but no reference to a **DEVIL ANCESTOR.** In fact, these were the men who God had created in Gen. 1:27 and whom He had declared to be "very good" in Gen. 1:31.

Nowhere in the Scripture does Jesus accuse Cain of being a "murderer from the beginning," that accusation was made against Satan. Even when John speaks of Cain as being of that wicked one, he does not equate this crime as happening in the beginning.

Then Wise makes a "flat. all-out false statement," when he says: "It is now confirmed that those who have usurped the title, Israel, and God's Chosen People, are in reality, the seed of the serpent, or children of perdition." But he has proven nothing of the sort, since Scriptural proof is lacking.

Knowing how the leaders of International Jewry act, and how they hate our King and everything He stands for, it would be easy for me to accept the **SEEDLINE DOCTRINE,** and say they were the literal "seed of Satan." But it wouldn't be true, since this is not what the Scripture says.

At the bottom of p.11, our author makes another curious statement when he implies that the story in Acts 19:13, was an attempt by Satan to cast out Satan. Do you honestly believe that if these seven wicked Jews had been literal "children of Satan," he would have allowed the evil spirit controlled man to beat up on them? Doesn't make much sense, now does it? Jesus pretty well exploded this theory in Luke 11:18 when He told the Pharisees: "If Satan is also divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? . .

Wise then goes on to explain the reason we do not see many Jewish farmers is because God cursed the soil for Cain and his descendants and that mark of Cain still remains on the Jewish race. Now I've known a few Jewish farmers, and they didn't seem to have any more problems with the soil, than the Christian Israelites who lived all around them. If I was a gambling man, I'd be willing to bet that if Wise, or any of the **SEEDLINE** crowd for that matter, were on a busy city street, they wouldn't be able to identify more than one Jew out of a hundred. I'll admit that a few of them have that distinctly Jewish look which is described in Isa. 3:9, but to say this is the "mark of Cain," is pretty well stretching the imagination.

There is little doubt that the Esau-Edomite Pharisees who confronted Jesus were the forerunners of modern Jewish Rabbinism, since they freely admit this to be true. There is also little doubt that they have been guilty of the blood of many righteous men, women and children since the death of Zacharias as mentioned in (Matt. *23:35).* We know they were the moving force behind Communism, which has slaughtered over 140 million people in the last 70 years. We know by reports from organizations such as **AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL**. that they are killing Christians at an estimated 350,000 per year right now and this is not counting the millions of unborn Israelite babies who are murdered in the mostly Jewish run abortion clinics everand ar. But while this is definite proof that they are an evil people, and you only have to read their religious book the **TALMUD,** to see what they are taught, this still does not prove that they were literally "sired by Satan," since we have seen many Israelites who are as cruel and evil in their actions against their fellow men.

The **SEEDLINE DOCTRINE** is a slam against the Israel people, and the purity of the blood line from Adam and Eve, since it accuses our mother Eve, the ancestor of our Lord, of being a prostitute of the worst kind. I refuse to accept this!

If Cain was the physical result of a sexual union between Satan and Mother Eve, does that mean that Jesus Christ was born as the result of a sexual act between the Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit? I don't believe that even the staunchest **SEEDLINER** would accept this blasphemy. But if we accept the first theory, how can we get away from the second?

Abraham had many "seeds", through Ishmael and his other sons, but the promised "seed" was through Isaac. Isaac had many sons, but the promised "seed" was through Jacob-Israel, the "seed" which produced Jesus Christ. But think about this. Christ could not have been of pure lineage, if Eve had been contaminated by Satan. You "can't have your cake and eat it too!"

I agree with Wise when he states on p.15: "An idea, thought, or concept that is adverse to the Bible, or the teaching of God, (which comes only through the Bible-ED), is indeed a dangerous thing;. so should this study bear the image of truth, it would be well to ponder and study it further, for the Bible to many should become a new and meaningful Book." I'm 100% in favor of this. I don't ask you to accept what Jack Mohr says or believes. I do ask you to be honest enough to find out for yourself what the Bible teaches, without being led astray by what men say, no matter how sincere they may be.

Study the Word in all its parts. Don't be influenced by the teachings of men such as Jack Mohr, James Wise, Dan Gayman, George Udvary, Earl Jones, or others, without checking them out against the Book.

These are all fallible men, and can be wrong. The Book will never lead you astray. Cling only to the truth of God's Word.

It may appear that this article was written in defense of the Jews. **IT WAS NOT!** I detest them as an International force. I know their leaders are the bitterest enemy of our God, His Son, our King, and of our faith. I know what their plans are for the takeover of this world, since they have clearly told us what they are, over and over again and I have eyes to see how they are carrying out these plans. Figuratively, I believe they are the special children of Satan and that as the Apostle Paul said: "They please not God, and are contrary to all men," (I Thess. 2:15). But let us use care when we call them the literal, physical children of Satan, for we cannot prove this from the Word.

We know that as a race, they have the sly characteristics of the serpent. We know from history that they are the makers of war and brag about it. In 1918, Count Mensdorf, the Jewish Ambassador from Austria to England was quoted as saying: "We (Jews) won the war (WWI); we made it, thrived on it; profited from it. It was our supreme revenge on Christianity."

The Jew, Marcus Eli Ravage, writing in the January 1928 issue of **CENTURY MAGAZINE** said: "We Jews are at the bottom of nearly all your wars; not only of the Russian but of every other major revolution in your history. . . We did it solely with the irresistable might of our spirit, with ideas, and propaganda."

The Jew Oscar Levy, in the preface to his book **THE WORLD SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION** said: "There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews. We Jews today are nothing else but the world's seducers, it's destroyers, it's incendiaries, it's executioners."

We know they have intimidated and imposed their will on our own government and every government in the nations of Christendom, through their dominance of finance, government, church, education and the media.

But let us be honest in our study and harsh evaluation of these people, no matter how much we would like to believe they are literally **BORN OF SATAN**. If this teaching is true, then as true followers of the Living Christ, let's prove it from the Book, not from what some man teaches.

The End